

25 September 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: OC/ODP Meeting with DDA, 22 September 1983

1. An issue was raised concerning a coordination mechanism between OC and ODP above the mid-level managers. The function of the recently formed OC Management and Liaison Staff was explained and ODP was invited to designate a management level entity to work with this OC coordination mechanism.

*Boys the*  
*line*

2. ODP asked who was the architect for the domestic data communications network. It was explained that the term "data" was too restrictive and that OC was responsible for a multi-purpose domestic network providing transmission capacity for secure voice, narrative message exchanges, imagery and video as well as data in the restricted sense. When ODP suggested that it could install and operate secure data circuits, the DDA stated that he did not want ODP to become involved in pulling wires, and/or installing cryptographic and communications equipment. It was agreed that OC will review its current regulations to ensure that the term data is not used without other modifiers to describe the multipurpose metropolitan network. OC's role as architect for this network was not contested.

3. ODP stated that the process for installing terminals in the Headquarters building was too complex because of the one for one request procedure. This was compared to the more efficient method of blanket requirements for new outbuildings. It was agreed that a method whereby ODP would provide listings of terminal requirements in bulk form in priority order would be explored.

STAT

4. ODP raised the issue of sharing facilities and personnel resources in outbuildings. It was agreed that there is no reason why this cannot be done. We should consider a joint operation at the first opportunity. (Could we move ODP into  and gain some space?)

5. It was agreed that OC and ODP would work to clarify respective charters. The mechanism for this process will be the Headquarters Regulations now being coordinated.

6. The issue of OC purchasing Wang PC terminals was raised. It was explained that OC issued an RFP for a domestic communications terminal. Wang, one of eight bidders, won the award.

SUBJECT: OC/ODP Meeting with DDA, 22 September 1983

OC must control this contract to ensure that special purpose communications software and hardware is delivered, that the funds are obligated before the end of FY-83 and that customers receive long promised M-28 replacements as soon as possible. ODP's concern that OC would become a PL provider in the metropolitan area was assuaged by OC's assurance that this was not intended. (ODP was concerned because the contract allows procurement of  terminals at the price bid by Wang.)

STAT

7. ODP maintained that MHF and MPS are duplicative. It was agreed that we would review MHF to ensure that it is being built with only the necessary capacity to serve customer systems, e.g., SAFE and ALLSTAR, to perform message formatting functions, support input devices, e.g., optical character readers, and to provide service until systems such as SAFE pick up the load. It was pointed out that SAFE had not resulted in any decrease on dissemination requirements placed upon CDS and, that no one can forecast when this will occur. We agreed to review MHF to determine if the scope can be reduced. Perhaps we should ask DDI if SAFE users will withdraw requirements for OC dissemination.

STAT



OC ROUTING	
ACTION	INFO
D/CO	
DD/CO	
SUPP	M/S
DATE	
FILE	

## Agenda for OC-ODP Meeting with DDA

- A. Domestic data processing, word processing, and telecommunications can be viewed as a totality.
  - 1. Enormous physical interconnections. The problems of one cannot be addressed independently of the other two.
  - 2. Similar project management problems across technologies.
  - 3. Competition for the same skills.
- B. Integration has been complicated by the facts that:
  - 1. These technologies come from vastly different managerial traditions.
  - 2. Large physical plant investments by both offices.
  - 3. Perceptions of overlapping charters.
- C. Similar factors
  - 1. Decisions in each area involve large amounts of money and complex technical cost evaluations. Similar backgrounds are needed to do appropriate analysis in each case.
  - 2. Great similarity exists in the type of project management skills and staff needed to implement applications of these technologies.
  - 3. Many systems, such as SAFE, require combining these technologies into integrated networks to handle computing, telecommunications, and office automation in an integrated way.
- D. Immediate problems
  - 1. No established coordination mechanism. Mid-level managers in OC and ODP have to work it out for themselves.

2. Who is the architect for the domestic data communications network?
3. What is the DA's long-term plan for cable dissemination and origination in the Metro area?
4. The lack of resources and coordination of terminal installations and building upgrades. Conflicting priorities between OC and ODP.
5. Conflicting priorities and overlap of responsibility for trouble shooting and fault correction in the data communications network.
6. Lack of consistency in network design.
7. Lack of consistency in TEMPEST requirements.
8. Duplicate solutions to electronic distribution of cables--MPS and MHF.
9. Need to clarify OC and ODP charters to get them published.
10. Who is architect for data communications network in new building?
11. Lack of expansion room in CDS may delay DESIST.

**E. Agency-wide ADP/Communications Issues**

1. NPIC's Upgrade
2. ALLSTAR Upgrade
3. Expansion of SAFE into DO, S&T, and DA
4. FBIS automation
5. OSO's initiatives

**F. Long-term Issues**

How will the Agency (DA) manage the competing/merging technologies of mainframe computer networks, word processing networks, communication networks, and microcomputers?